

#### REMARKS

Claims 1 and 11 have been amended to respectively include the limitations of claims 3/4 and 13/14, as suggested by the Examiner during a telephone interview on June 10, 2009. In addition, claims 1-10 have been amended to specifically tie the various method steps to a machine (a computer system), as presented in a set of amended claims informally submitted before, and discussed during, the June 10 interview. Finally, claim 11 has been amended to also recite implementation in a computer system, as suggested by the Examiner during the June 10 interview.

It is believed that the amendments overcome the outstanding rejections under 35 USC §§101 and 103(a), and render the claims allowable, pursuant to the agreement reached during the interview. It is understood that the agreement may be subject to an update search.

In addition, as noted in the paper informally submitted before the interview, the rejection under **35 USC §112** is traversed on the grounds that calculation of the parameters in advance of runtime is disclosed in paragraph [0023], lines 9-14 of the original specification (page 8, lines 1-4), which points out that the normalization parameters of the verification unit are stored in the normalization database 11 of the verification unit (see also, Fig. 3). Since generation of the sequence of verification feature vectors during runtime is carried out according to the normalization parameters stored in the verification unit (page 7, lines 21-24), it is inherent that the normalization parameters must be calculated in

advance of runtime (they cannot be stored unless they have been calculated), thereby clearly supporting the recitation of calculation in advance. It is believed that the Examiner has implicitly agreed with this argument, although it was not specifically discussed during the interview, and that the rejection has been overcome.

#### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the application are now believed to be in order, and such action is hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue that the Examiner feels may be best resolved through another telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC

/Benjamin E. Urcia/

Date: June 24, 2009

By: BENJAMIN E. URCIA  
Registration No. 33,805

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC  
625 Slaters Lane, 4th Floor  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Telephone: (703) 683-0500